

**REMARKS**

The amendment previously submitted was objected to as being non compliant for improper claim identifier. Applicant resubmits the amendment with the proper identifier for the amended list of claims. The remainder of the amendment and response remain the same as was previously presented. It is hoped that examination will now proceed.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the invention. Support for the amendment is found in the originally filed claim 1. No new matter has been entered hereby and entry of the amendment is requested.

**RESPONSE**

The Examiner imposed a requirement for restriction of the claims to two groups:

- I. Claims 1-52, drawn to polymeric species, classified in class 528, subclass 271; and
- II. Claims 53-57, drawn to polymeric compositions, classified in 524, subclass 599.

Applicant elects claims 1-52 of group I with traverse and cancels claims 53-57 without prejudice.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-52 were rejected for being indefinite on two grounds.

The Examiner pointed out that the definition of PA as a polyamine is incorrect since it is clearly stated that PA may be a polyalkylpolyamine, a polyalkylene imine, a polyallylamine, a cycloaliphatic amine. Amendment of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon has been made. PA is now defined as being selected from the group consisting of polyalkylpolyamine, a polyalkylene imine, a polyallylamine, a cycloaliphatic amine.

The examiner also pointed out that since the definition of PE states that it has a molecular weight of 500-20,000, it is clear that m should represent the degree of polymerization and the number of units of PE that is attached to PA. Applicant accepts the Examiner's suggestion and has amended the structure of the claimed

PATENT  
DOCKET NO. 0444-4069  
Express Mail #ER 146 332 660US

compound to correctly reflect that PE is a polyester with a molecular weight of between 500-20,000 and has a degree of polymerization, m, in the range of 1-100.

The amendment is made to correct obvious errors and not to narrow the scope of the invention. As amended it is believed that claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are now clear and definite and the rejection on this ground is now moot.

No other issues were raised. It is believed that the claims as amended are allowable and an early allowance is requested.

Applicant's attorney wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone conversation regarding the restriction requirement and the problems with the definitions of PA and PE. The Examiner's helpful suggestions are deeply appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Maria C.H. Lin  
Registration No. 29,323

Dated: August 10, 2004

Morgan & Finnegan  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101  
212-415-8700  
212-415-8701(Fax)  
Email: mclin@morganfinnegan.com